

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on February 8, 2005.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-13, 15, 18, 22, 27, 30, 31, and 34 are amended. Claims 1-35 remain pending in this application.

Claim 9 is amended for clarity.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 was objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 11.

Claim 14 is canceled.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

Applicant respectfully traverses and request reconsideration of this rejection.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, and 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. (U.S. 6,201,276) in view of Basceri et al. (U.S. 6,476,432).

Applicant respectfully traverses for the reasons discussed below.

MPEP section 706.02(l)(2) states that the following statement is sufficient evidence to establish common ownership of, or an obligation for assignment to, the same person(s) or organizations(s):

Applications and references (whether patents, patent applications, patent application publications, etc.) will be considered by the examiner to be owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person, at the time the invention was made, if the applicant(s) or an attorney or agent of record makes a statement to the effect that the application and the reference were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person.

Applicant makes such a statement with regard to the present application and Agarwal et al. (U.S. 6,201,276). Specifically, applicant states that at the time the inventions were made, the present application and Agarwal et al. (U.S. 6,201,276) were owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to Micron Technology Inc.

As the applicant have met the requirements of MPEP 706.02(l)(2), applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) in accordance with 35 USC § 103(c).

Claims 10, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. in view of Basceri et al., and further in view of Deng et al. (U.S. 5,980,977).

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, 2, and 6-9. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 10, 12, and 13.

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. in view of Basceri et al., and further in view of Deng et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, 2, and 6-9. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 15-17.

Claims 18, 19, and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. in view of Basceri et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, 2, and 6-9. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 18, 19, and 23-26.

Claims 27 and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. in view of Basceri et al., and further in view of Deng et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, 2, and 6-9. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 27 and 29.

Claims 30, 32, and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. in view of Basceri et al., and further in view of Deng et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, 2, and 6-9. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 30, 32, and 33.

Claims 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al. in view of Basceri et al., and further in view of Deng et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least reasons similar to the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, 2, and 6-9. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 34 and 35.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-5, 11, 20-22, 28, and 31 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3-5, 11, 20-22, 28, and 31 depend from independent claims 1, 10, 18, 27, and 30. In view of the reasons discussed above regarding claims 1, 10, 18, 27, and 30, Applicant believes that claims 3-5, 11, 20-22, 28, and 31 are allowable in the dependent form, as written.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SAM YANG ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date

9 May 2005

By



Viet V. Tong
Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 9 day of May, 2005.

Tina Kohout

Name



Signature